A debate between Ali Sina and Dr. G. R. Farhad Assar Part 1

A debate between **Ali Sina** and

Dr. G. R. Farhad Assar
Edinburg, Scotland, UK
Email: grfa123@tiscali.co.uk

Part I

Dear Dr. Sina,

Thank you for your prompt response. Unfortunately, my decision to join your "forum" was quite pre-mature. After reading some of your own comments and the ones posted by your subscribers I quickly realised that I must not waste my time responding to such long strings of baseless arguments. Your site has unfortunately turned into a maggot-infested carcass that has attracted all sorts of extremists, e.g., the Zionists, Evangelists and anti-Islamists. I will therefore be making a complete fool of myself if I attempt even to address some of the most basic errors in your and their theories.

Unfortunately, you have clearly demonstrated your minimal grasp of Mathematics and Physics. You speak of "order" in our nature whereas the opposite is true. To perceive this you have to speed up the passage of time to note that the peace, tranquillity and order you allude to is non-existent. What we see is not what happened in the past or takes place right now in the universe. Where is your kind of order in sub-atomic dimensions or at or near the centres of billions of galaxies? There is nothing except chaos in its most violent form in those scales and places. The two macroscopic and microscopic worlds know nothing of the sort of order you have stated. Four billion years ago our planet earth was spinning at least five times faster than it does today and our moon was about twenty thousand kilometres away. Do you know what kind of turmoil our mother earth was in then? And do you know that those very chaotic conditions led to the birth of biological life on our planet?

The story goes on. It certainly does not finish here. You only have to have a basic knowledge of the violent perturbances in the sub-atomic dimensions to appreciate the complete lack of your kind of order. Furthermore, I was deluded by the "faithfree" part of the name of your site and thought it to be an anti-faith forum altogether and not exclusively anti-Islam. So, you are only presenting an skewed view of "faith".

The point of this site is not to prove or disprove the existence of God or define its nature. Our objective is to prove that Islam is a cult and not a religion. So for the sake of argument I accept whatever your definition of God is and move on to disprove that Muhammad was a lair and a psychopath and not a prophet of that or any God.

> You want someone to prove you wrong on a few points. For this you have promised to shut down your site (or at least part of it that deals with your relentless attack on Mohammad's personality, Islam, Quran and Allah). I believe you must never endeavour to do so even if proven wrong.
>
> Your site must remain accessible to the knowledgeable and learned all over the world in order for them to witness the sheer ignorance of your followers and yourself. You want someone to prove to you things that can neither be proven nor refuted.

So what is your basis for believing in Islam? Muslims are killing people left and right and they think this will take them to paradise. And you tell me that you can't even prove that belief to be true? What if Islam is just the emanation of a psychopathic mind?

It is like jumping from an airplane without having any evidence that the bag you are strapping to your shoulder is actually a parachute. Shouldn't you first verify and see whether it actually opens?

Your position makes no sense to any sane person. You are willing to kill and die for this belief yet you tell me there is no way you can prove it?

Would a real God make such crude joke and send a guidance that can't be proven? Then how in the world would people know if this man who makes such outlandish claims is actually a real messenger or a charlatan?

> You have simply resorted to a very old and canning ploy known to the whole of human race for millennia. How ca n anyone prove or disprove something for which one does not have and cannot find corroborating and undisputed evidence?

Of course there are evidences to find out whether someone who claims to be a messenger is true or false? Muhammad has none of them.

In late 19th century in Sudan **Mohammed Ahmed ibn Abdullah** proclaimed himself El Mahdi.

Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani. Mirza Gulam, made the same claim in India

Syed Ali Mohammad Bab made a similar claim in Iran

and in the 1970s the Egyptian **Rashad Khalifa** also laid the same claim in America.

Tell me why should we accept Muhammad's claim and reject these claimants?

Certainly no wise God would leave humans without any clue. That would be utterly unjust. There must be at least one clue to distinguish a false prophet from a true one. If you can't

give even one proof that Muhammad was indeed a messenger of God then it is obvious that he was an impostor.

On the other hand I have given over a hundred proofs that he was not a messenger of God but a psychopath and a narcissist, someone like Hitler, with charisma but without conscience. A pathetic and a convincing liar.

You can't prove he was a messenger of God. You can't disprove my charges against him. What the hell you are believing. Isn't this insanity?

I wouldn't give a hoot what you believe, if you did not kill people because of your belief. But you want to kill me and kill everybody else and you are doing it on daily basis and you tell me you have no proof that this man who tells you kill innocent people is actually a messenger of God?

If you knew this simple fact you would never have made such an illogical demand. Didn't you know that no court of law in the "civilised" part of our world allows and admits hear-say evidence? Can you prove any of the following points? For each of them established beyond reasonable doubt I pledge to donate $2500 to the charity of your choice:

1 - that Moses was a legitimate child of an Israelite couple.

2 - that Moses' emergence in the court of the Egyptian pharaoh was as we know it to be.

3 - that Moses did not have sex with under-age girls while enjoying the luxuries of pharaonic life for several decades.

4 - that Moses did not kill or was not responsible for the sheding of innocent's blood.

5 - that Moses did not commit adultery while living as an Egyptian prince.

6 - that Moses saw and spoke to God on Mount Sinai.

7 - that Moses' staff turned into a serpent that devoured those conjured up by the Egyptian magicians.

8 - that Moses' staff turned the Nile into a river of blood.

9 - that God covered Egypt with a miasma that killed the first-born in every Egyptian household.

10 - that God poured down from the sky drops of fire.

11 - that God heard Moses' pleas and parted the Red Sea for him and the Israelites to cross and then drowned the whole of the pursuing Egyptian army.

12 - that Moses again saw and spoke to God who sent a column of fire to carve out, on two slabs of stone, the "Ten Commandments".

13 - that God promised Moses and his followers a piece of land that by today's standards includes Egypt, Palestine, Jordan, Syria, Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and the whole of the Arabian peninsula.

I'll promise the same level of contribution to your choice of charity if you prove any of the following too:

1 - that Jesus was born from a virgin. For this you must scientifically prove that Jesus' mother had her hymen intact and that she had not been deflowered by a man.

2 - that Jesus' mother did not have an egg in her womb fertilised by a man's sperm.

3 - that Jesus' mother was visited and impregnated by God's angel.

4 - that Jesus' cells lacked the male chromosome that he should have inherited from a biological and not divine father.

5 - that Jesus was son of God.

6 - that Jesus himself claimed to be son of God.

7 - that Jesus walked on water, defying the laws of gravity and buoyancy.

8 - that Jesus brought sight to blind.

9 - that Jesus restored movement to paralysed limbs.

10 - that Jesus gave life to a dead man.

11 - that Jesus fed a large group of his followers with just a few loafs of bread and that this fully satisfied their hunger.

12 - that Jesus himself rose from death and ascended into God's paradise.

13 - that Jesus descended from the heaven and spoke to his disciples.

14 - that Jesus died on the cross to take away the entire sins of his followers.

15 - that Jesus is alive and will one day return again.

Of course, for proving each of the above you must not rely on the hear-say and uncorroborated evidence presented in the Old and New Testament. We all know that the validity of the claims in these two books cannot be scientifically verified.

As for your comments about a God superior to the god of all religions I totally agree with you. Unfortunately, however, you have failed in your arguments to prove the existence of this God, the Master Scientist. Regrettably, the identity of this God must remain concealed from the majority of "human beings". Otherwise, our world will be turned into a real hell by the uneducated, uninformed and criminals. The only god capable of controlling the human-like beings, who, unfortunately, constitute 99.99% of the human species on our planet, is the god of religion. He is both merciful and vengeful. He rewards one for his/her good deeds and severely punishes all sorts of crime. The God you advocate will never ever be comprehended and acknowledged by the whole of our species. So, you have just wasted your time and life trying to prove one thing and disprove another. Your website will stand as a testimony to man's sheer ignorance of the real truth in the universe. Finally, do you also advocate and endorse the incestual relationships with ones mother, sisters, daughters, aunts, nieces, etc. which are rife in your chosen country of residence and all over the "civilised" world, including the United

Kingdom of Great Britain (the land of Mr. W. C.)? What is your view of decency?

You ask about Moses and Jesus. That is not a question to ask me. I am no defender of these two possibly mythical personages. Bible is a load of nonsense. Why you even bring that up? Does that make you feel better to follow a false doctrine if others also follow other false doctrines?

Now I suppose you want to know then why I am not attacking Judaism and Christianity. The reason is that these religions do not promote hate. They present no danger to anyone anymore and are personal faiths. That is good enough for me. Islam is however dangerous. It must be exposed publicly. Whoever attempted to do that was assassinated or executed. So the truth about Islam is yet untold.

Only now people are able to speak out and that is thanks to the Internet. They can reach millions of people without fearing being killed.

Furthermore, the Jews and the Christians are not in the business of killing people for their faith and their religions does not preach violence. We do not hear anyone blowing himself up while killing numerous other innocent people shouting Jesus is great or Jehovah is great.

Islam is dangerous. Muslims are killing people. Faith is a positive element in the lives of the followers of other faiths. Often they do humanitarian deeds motivated by their faiths. So Judaism, Christianity and other faiths are not only harmless, but sometimes they could play positive roles. Islam is the only cult that has no positive side to it. It is only hate, only death, only pain, only war. Islam is a danger and must be eradicated if humanity is to survive.

What baffles me is that you try to prove Moses and Jesus were false prophets and you feel good that you Muslims are not the only misguided follower of a false doctrine, but forget that once you succeed you actually have reconfirmed that Muhammad was indeed a liar because he said Moses and Jesus were prophets.

Let us address the same argument in another light. Let us say Moses and Jesus were false prophets because their followers cannot prove anything in their holy books to be from God. Does that automatically make Muhammad a true prophet because Muslims also are unable to prove anything in the Quran to be from God? This is a bizarre logic. By this most absurd way of thinking of yours, all the cults are vested with legitimacy because none of them can prove anything they say to be true. I can’t fathom the absurdity of the Muslim mind.

> What do you mean by democracy and liberty? Hasn't it occurred to you that you have mistaken corruption and man's exploitation of man with democracy and freedom?

Democracy means rule of people over people. People can make mistake and they will correct their mistakes. So democracy is constantly evolving. In democracies corrupt people are singled out, exposed, shamed, and impeached. Democracy does not allow exploitation of man. It is precisely designed to avoid that.

But in the religious dictatorship that you are advocating people are exploited by a few who claim to have divine authority over them. They have absolute power and no one can question them. If anyone questions them they are charged with defying God and severely punished. And despite this you can't prove that this authority vested on the Mullahs comes from God. These few men wield absolute power. Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Who vested these men with divine authority? What is their credentials? Can you prove that they are legitimate representatives of God on Earth? According to your own confession, you can’t even prove the legitimacy of Muhammad as a prophet. Even if Islam were a true religion, what proof you have that these Mullahs are authorized to rule on behalf of God? You can’t do that. So what is the difference between these Mullahs and a bunch of gangsters and thugs who usurp the power and keep it with terror and execution of anyone who protests? Answer to this question.